

# Eden Environmental Citizen's Group, LLC

September 7, 2019

Via US Mail, Certified USPS Tracking No. 7018 0360 0000 8017 7248

Brian Eliason Modesto Trailer Haul Concrete & Rock Co 1306 Blue Gum Avenue Modesto, CA 95351

Re: 60-Day Notice of Violations and Intent to File Suit Under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act ("Clean Water Act")

To Officers, Directors, Operators, Property Owners/Landlords, and/or Facility Managers of Modesto Trailer Haul Concrete & Rock Co., Inc.:

This letter is being sent to you on behalf of Eden Environmental Citizen's Group, LLC ("EDEN") to give legal notice that EDEN intends to file a civil action against Modesto Trailer Haul Concrete & Rock Co., Inc. and its corporate officers ("Discharger" or "MTHC") for violations of the Federal Clean Water Act ("CWA" or "Act") 33 U.S.C. § 1251 *et seq.*, that EDEN believes are occurring at the MTHC facility located at 1306 Blue Gum Avenue in Modesto, California ("the Facility" or "the site").

EDEN is an environmental citizen's group established under the laws of the State of California to protect, enhance, and assist in the restoration of all rivers, creeks, streams, wetlands, vernal pools, and tributaries of California, for the benefit of its ecosystems and communities.

EDEN formally registered as a limited liability company (LLC) association with the California Secretary of State on June 22, 2018; however, since at least July 1, 2014, EDEN has existed as an unincorporated environmental citizen's association with members who remain associated with EDEN as of the date of this Notice.

As discussed below, the Facility's discharges of pollutants degrade water quality and harm aquatic life in the Facility's Receiving Waters, which are waters of the United States and described in Section II.B, below. EDEN has members throughout California. Some of EDEN's members live, work, and/or recreate near the Receiving Waters and use and enjoy the Receiving Waters for surfing, kayaking, camping, fishing, boating, swimming, hiking, cycling, bird watching, picnicking, viewing wildlife, and/or engaging in scientific study.

At least one of EDEN's current members has standing to bring suit against MTHC, as the unlawful discharge of pollutants from the Facility as alleged herein has had an adverse effect particular to him or her and has resulted in actual harm to the specific EDEN member(s).

Further, the Facility's discharges of polluted storm water and non-storm water are ongoing and continuous. As a result, the interests of certain individual EDEN members have been, are being, and will continue to be adversely affected by the failure of MTHC to comply with the General Permit and the Clean Water Act.

CWA section 505(b) requires that sixty (60) days prior to the initiation of a civil action under CWA section 505(a), a citizen must give notice of intent to file suit. 33 U.S.C. § 1365(b). Notice must be given to the alleged violator, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), and the State in which the violations occur.

As required by CWA section 505(b), this Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit provides notice to the Discharger of the violations which have occurred and continue to occur at the Facility. After the expiration of sixty (60) days from the date of this Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit, EDEN intends to file suit in federal court against the Discharger under CWA section 505(a) for the violations described more fully below.

# I. THE SPECIFIC STANDARD, LIMITATION, OR ORDER VIOLATED

EDEN's investigation of the Facility has uncovered significant, ongoing, and continuous violations of the CWA and the General Industrial Storm Water Permit issued by the State of California (NPDES General Permit No. CAS000001 [State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB")] Water Quality Order No. 92-12-DWQ, as amended by Order No. 97-03-DWQ ("1997 Permit") and by Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ ("2015 Permit") (collectively, the "General Permit").

As more fully described in Section III, below, EDEN alleges that in its operations of the Facility, MTHC has committed ongoing violations of the substantive and procedural requirements of the Federal Clean Water Act, California Water Code §13377; the General Permit, the Regional Water Board Basin Plan, the California Toxics Rule (CTR) 40 C.F.R. § 131.38, and California Code of Regulations, Title 22, § 64431.

#### II. THE LOCATION OF THE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

## A. The Facility

The location of the point sources from which the pollutants identified in this Notice are discharged in violation of the CWA is MTHC's permanent facility address of 1306 Blue Gum Avenue in Modesto, California.

MTHC Facility is an establishment engaged in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of concrete ready-mix, landscape and construction materials. Facility operations are covered under Standard Industrial Classification Code (SIC) 3273-Ready-mix concrete.

Based on the EPA's Industrial Storm Water Fact Sheet for Sector E - Glass, Clay, Cement, Concrete, and Gypsum Product Manufacturing Facilities, polluted discharges from operations at the Facility contain pH affecting substances; metals, such as iron and aluminum; toxic metals, such as lead, zinc, cadmium, chromium, and arsenic; chemical oxygen demand ("COD"); biochemical oxygen demand ("BOD"); total suspended solids ("TSS"); benzene; gasoline and diesel fuels; fuel additives; coolants; and oil and grease ("O&G"). Many of these pollutants are on the list of chemicals published by the State of California as known to cause cancer, birth defects, and/or developmental or reproductive harm.

Information available to EDEN indicates that the Facility's industrial activities and associated materials are exposed to storm water, and that each of the substances listed on the EPA's Industrial Storm Water Fact Sheet is a potential source of pollutants at the Facility.

# **B.** The Affected Receiving Waters

The Facility discharges into a municipal storm drain system, which then discharges to the Lower Stanislaus River, a tributary of the San Joaquin River ("Receiving Waters").

San Joaquin River is a water of the United States. The CWA requires that water bodies such as the San Joaquin River meet water quality objectives that protect specific "beneficial uses." The Central Valley Regional Water Board has issued its *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins* ("Basin Plan") to delineate those water quality objectives.

The Basin Plan identifies the "Beneficial Uses" of water bodies in the region. The Beneficial Uses for the Receiving Waters downstream of the Facility include: Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN), Agricultural Supply (AGR), Industrial Process Supply (PRO), Industrial Service Supply (IND), Navigation (NAV), Water Contact Recreation (REC-1), Noncontact Water Recreation (REC-2), Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM), Cold Freshwater Habitat (COLD), Wildlife Habitat (WILD), Migration (MIGR), and Spawning, Reproduction, and/or Early Development (SPWN).

A water body is impaired pursuant to section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1313(d), when its Beneficial Uses are not being achieved due to the presence of one or more pollutants.

The San Joaquin River is impaired for Selenium, Salinity, Total Dissolved Solids (TDS), Electrical Conductivity (EC), Boron, Organophosphorus (OP) Pesticides (Diazinon, Chlorpyrifos), Oxygen-Demanding Substances (BOD/Algae, Ammonia, Organic N) Organochlorine "Legacy" Pesticides (DDT, Chlordane, Dieldrin, Toxaphene, etc.) Mercury, Pathogen-Indicator Organisms, E. coli, Fecal Coliforms, and Toxicity of Unknown Cause.

Polluted storm water and non-storm water discharges from industrial facilities, such as the Facility, contribute to the further degradation of already impaired surface waters, and harm aquatic dependent wildlife.

#### III. VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT AND GENERAL PERMIT

# A. Failure to Apply for NPDES Coverage

The CWA prohibits storm water discharges without a permit. 33 U.S.C. § 1342; 40 C.F.R. § 122.26. The General Permit regulates operators of facilities subject to coverage under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) storm water permit, as these operators discharge storm water associated with specific industrial activities identified by both industrial activity and SIC (Standard Industrial Classification) codes in Attachment A of the Permit.

MTHC's primary industrial activity is listed on Attachment A as an industrial activity subject to NPDES coverage. Thus, the Facility was required to apply for coverage under the Permit in order to commence business operations, pursuant to Section I.Q of the Permit.

According to California Secretary of State records, MTHC commenced its operations at the site on or before January 31, 1994.

MTHC has not in fact yet applied for NPDES coverage.

## B. Failure to Develop and Implement a SWPPP and Site Map

MTHC has also failed to develop and implement either a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") or Site Map for the Facility.

Failure to develop or implement an adequate SWPPP is a violation of Sections II.B.4.f and X of the General Permit.

# C. Failure to Develop, Implement and/or Revise a Monitoring and Reporting Program Pursuant to the General Permit

Section XI of the General Permit requires Dischargers to develop and implement a storm water monitoring and reporting program ("M&RP") prior to conducting industrial activities. Dischargers have an ongoing obligation to revise the M&RP as necessary to ensure compliance with the General Permit.

The objective of the M&RP is to detect and measure the concentrations of pollutants in a facility's discharge, and to ensure compliance with the General Permit's Discharge Prohibitions, Effluent Limitations, and Receiving Water Limitations. An adequate M&RP ensures that BMPs are effectively reducing and/or eliminating pollutants at the Facility, and it must be evaluated and revised whenever appropriate to ensure compliance with the General Permit.

#### 1. Failure to Conduct Visual Observations

Section XI(A) of the General Permit requires all Dischargers to conduct visual observations at least once each month, and sampling observations at the same time sampling occurs at a discharge location.

Observations must document the presence of any floating and suspended material, oil and grease, discolorations, turbidity, odor and the source of any pollutants. Dischargers must document and maintain records of observations, observation dates, locations observed, and responses taken to reduce or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges.

EDEN believes that MTHC has failed to conduct monthly and sampling visual observations pursuant to Section XI(A) of the General Permit.

#### 2. Failure to Collect and Analyze Storm Water Samples

In addition, EDEN alleges that MTHC has failed to provide the Regional Water Board with annual documented results of Facility run-off sampling as required under Sections XI.B.2 and XI.B.11.a of Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ, in violation of the General Permit and the CWA.

Section XI.B.2 of the General Permit requires that all Dischargers collect and analyze storm water samples from two Qualifying Storm Events ("QSEs") within the first half of each reporting year (July 1 to December 31), and two (2) QSEs within the second half of each reporting year (January 1 to June 30).

As of the date of this Notice, MTHC has failed to upload into the SMARTS database system *any* facility storm water run-off sample analyses.

## D. Failure to File Annual Reports

MTHC has failed to comply with Section XVI.A of the General Permit, which provides as follows: "The Discharger shall certify and submit via SMARTS an Annual Report no later than July 15th following each reporting year using the standardized format and checklists in SMARTS."

To date, MTHC has failed to file its Annual Reports for the reporting years 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19.

## E. <u>Deficient BMP Implementation</u>

Sections I.C, V.A and X.C.1.b of the General Permit require Dischargers to identify and implement minimum and advanced Best Management Practices ("BMPs") that comply with the Best Available Technology ("BAT") and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology ("BCT") requirements of the General Permit to reduce or prevent discharges of pollutants in their storm water discharge in a manner that reflects best industry practice, considering technological availability and economic practicability and achievability.

EDEN alleges that MTHC has been conducting industrial activities at the site without adequate BMPs to prevent resulting non-storm water discharges. Non-storm water discharges resulting from these activities are not from sources that are listed among the authorized non-storm water discharges in the General Permit, and thus are always prohibited.

MTHC's failure to develop and/or implement adequate BMPs and pollution controls to meet BAT and BCT at the Facility violates and will continue to violate the CWA and the Industrial General Permit each day the Facility discharges storm water without meeting BAT and BCT.

#### F. Discharges in Violation of the General Permit

Except as authorized by Special Conditions of the General Permit, Discharge Prohibition III(B) prohibits permittees from discharging materials other than storm water (non-storm water discharges) either directly or indirectly to waters of the United States. Unauthorized non-storm water discharges must be either eliminated or permitted by a separate NPDES permit.

Information available to EDEN indicates that unauthorized non-storm water discharges occur at the Facility due to inadequate BMP development and/or implementation necessary to prevent these discharges.

EDEN alleges that the Discharger has discharged storm water containing excessive levels of pollutants from the Facility to its Receiving Waters during at least every significant local rain event over 0.1 inches in the last five (5) years.

EDEN hereby puts the Discharger on notice that each time the Facility discharges prohibited non-storm water in violation of Discharge Prohibition III.B of the General Permit is a separate and distinct violation of the General Permit and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a).

# G. Failure to Comply with the Mandates of the Regional Water Board

Pursuant to Section XIX of the General Permit, Regional Water Boards have general authority to enforce the provisions and requirements of the General Permit, including reviewing SWPPPs, Monitoring Implementation Plans, ERA Reports, and Annual Reports and requiring Dischargers to revise and re-submit PRDs, conducting compliance inspections, and taking enforcement actions.

As of the date of this Notice, MTHC has failed to comply with mandates of the Regional Water Board that it apply for General Permit coverage.

# H. Failure to Train Employees and Designate a Pollution Prevention Team

Section X.D.1 of the General Permit requires each Facility to establish a Pollution Prevention Team, who is then responsible for assisting with the implementation of the requirements of the General Permit. The Facility is also required to identify alternate team members to implement the SWPPP and conduct required monitoring when the regularly assigned Pollution Prevention Team members are temporarily unavailable (due to vacation, illness, out of town business, or other absences).

In addition, Section X.H.f of the General Permit requires that each Facility ensure that all of its Pollution Prevention Team members implementing the various compliance activities of the General Permit are properly trained in at least the following minimum requirements: BMP implementation, BMP effectiveness evaluations, visual observations, and monitoring activities. Further, if a Facility enters Level 1 status, appropriate team members must be trained by a QISP.

As of the date of this Notice, MTHC has failed to establish and train a Pollution Prevention Team, in violation of Sections X.D.1 and X.H.f of the General Permit.

MTHC may have had other violations that can only be fully identified and documented once discovery and investigation have been completed. Hence, to the extent possible, EDEN includes such violations in this Notice and reserves the right to amend this Notice, if necessary, to include such further violations in future legal proceedings.

### IV. THE PERSON OR PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE VIOLATIONS

The entities responsible for the alleged violations are MTHC, as well as employees of the Facility responsible for compliance with the CWA.

# V. THE DATE, DATES, OR REASONABLE RANGE OF DATES OF THE VIOLATIONS

The range of dates covered by this 60-day Notice is from at least July 1, 2014, to the date of this Notice. EDEN may from time to time update this Notice to include all violations which may occur after the range of dates covered by this Notice. Some of the violations are continuous in nature; therefore, each day constitutes a violation.

#### VI. CONTACT INFORMATION

The entity giving this 60-day Notice is Eden Environmental Citizen's Group ("EDEN").

Aiden Sanchez EDEN ENVIRONMENTAL CITIZEN'S GROUP 2151 Salvio Street #A2-319 Concord, CA 94520

Telephone: (925) 732-0960

Email: <u>Edenenvcitizens@gmail.com</u> (emailed correspondence is preferred)

Website: edenenvironmental.org

EDEN has retained counsel in this matter as follows:

Paul J. Warner Paul Warner Law P.O. Box 4755 Arcata, CA 95518

Telephone: (707) 825-7725 Email: <u>pjwlaw@sbcglobal.net</u>

To ensure proper response to this Notice, all communications should be addressed to EDEN's legal counsel, Mr. Paul Warner.

#### VII. RELIEF SOUGHT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT

CWA §§ 505(a)(1) and 505(f) provide for citizen enforcement actions against any "person," including individuals, corporations, or partnerships, for violations of NPDES permit requirements and for un-permitted discharges of pollutants. 33 U.S.C. §§ 1365(a)(1) and (f), §1362(5).

Pursuant to Section 309(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(d), and the Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation, 40 C.F.R. § 19.4, each separate violation of the Clean Water Act subjects the violator to a penalty for all violations occurring during the period commencing five (5) years prior to the date of the Notice Letter. These provisions of law authorize civil penalties of \$37,500.00 per day per violation for all Clean Water Act violations after January 12, 2009, and \$51,570.00 per day per violation for violations that occurred after November 2, 2015.

In addition to civil penalties, EDEN will seek injunctive relief preventing further violations of the Clean Water Act pursuant to Sections 505(a) and (d), 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a) and (d), declaratory relief, and such other relief as permitted by law.

Lastly, pursuant to Section 505(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(d) and California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5, EDEN will seek to recover its pre and post-litigation costs, including all attorneys' and experts' fees and costs incurred (see Southern California Alliance of Publicly Owned Treatment Works v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (9th Cir. 2017) 853 F.3d 1076; Vasquez v. State of California (2008) 45 Cal.4th 243).

## VIII. CONCLUSION

The CWA specifically provides a 60-day notice period to promote resolution of disputes. EDEN encourages MTHC's counsel to contact **EDEN's counsel** within 20 days of receipt of this Notice to initiate a discussion regarding the violations detailed herein. Please do not contact EDEN directly.

During the 60-day notice period, EDEN is willing to discuss effective remedies for the violations; however, if MTHC wishes to pursue such discussions in the absence of litigation, it is suggested those discussions be initiated soon so that they may be completed before the end of the 60-day notice period. EDEN reserves the right to file a lawsuit if discussions are continuing when the notice period ends.

Very truly yours,

AIDEN SANCHEZ

Eden Environmental Citizen's Group

## Copies to:

Andrew Wheeler: Wheeler.andrew@Epa.gov

Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

State Water Resources Control Board Eileen Sobeck, Executive Director eileen.sobeck@waterboards.ca.gov Mayumi Okamoto, Office of Enforcement: Mayumi.Okamoto@waterboards.ca.gov stormwater@waterboards.ca.gov

Regional Administrator, U.S. EPA – Region 9 Jennifer Pierce: <u>pierce.jennifer@epa.gov</u> Laurie Kermish: <u>Kermish.Laurie@epa.gov</u>